

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in reply to the Examiner's Action dated 25 March 2005. Applicants have canceled claims 209-219. Applicants have added claims 247-278 relating to filter media having a polymer such as an addition polymer or a polyurethane polymer, each combined with either a cross linking agent or a resinous additive. Support is found at Column 7, lines 1-9; Column 9, lines 34-37 and Column 10, lines 6-55 of parent patent, Chung et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,743,273 and in the claims as filed in the parent utility application.

In the Examiner's paragraph 1, the Examiner remarks regarding the orientation of the disclosure on pages 47-49. These pages have been amended accordingly and are attached to this Amendment and Response. Applicants have updated the status of the parent applications in accordance with paragraph 2. Applicants have amended claims 220-229 as suggested in Examiner's paragraph 3. Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful review of the specification and claims.

The Examiner has rejected, in paragraphs 4 and 5, claims 190-197 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Emig et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,395,046. While Applicants do not acquiesce in the Examiner's position, Applicants have amended the claims to avoid the rejection of Emig et al. to the degree the amendment is satisfactory. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained.

In this regard, Applicants have amended claims 190-197 to show that the fine fiber polyvinyl alcohol polymer is crosslinked in the fine fiber layer. Such crosslinking is not shown in Emig et al. Emig et al. is, therefore, no longer an anticipatory reference. Further, it would not be obvious to crosslink the polyvinyl alcohol polymers of Emig et al. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow these claims to issue.

In paragraph 6, the Examiner rejects claims 209-219 under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e) over Healey, U.S. Patent No. 6,554,881. Applicants have canceled claims 209-219 without prejudice.

In paragraph 7, the Examiner has rejected claims 239-246 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kahlbaugh et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,672,399. Applicants have canceled claims 239-246 without prejudice and they are no longer in the case.

In paragraphs 8 and 9, the Examiner has rejected claims 201-208 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kahlbaugh et al., in view of Miller et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,759,782. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 201-208 have been amended to recite that the nylon 66 element of claim 201 (b) is a blend of a nylon 66 and a hydrophobic additive material. Applicants assert that neither Kahlbaugh et al. nor Miller et al. suggests that the fine fiber layer can comprise a nylon and an additive material as claimed. Therefore, the subject matter of claims 201-208 is neither anticipated nor obvious in light of cited references. Further, it would not be obvious to combine the nylon polymer of the claims with an additive for the purpose of improving the temperature or humidity stability of the fiber.

In paragraphs 10-16, the Examiner rejects claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Gogins et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,716,274 and/or Gillingham et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,673,136. Applicants have included with this letter, an appropriately drafted Terminal Disclaimer obviating the double patenting rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that all claims as amended in the application are now allowable. Applicants now respectfully request the Examiner to pass these claims to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

21 July '05
Date

Mark DiPietro
Mark DiPietro
Reg. No. 28,707
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: (612) 371-5375
E-mail: mdipietro@merchant-gould.com

23552

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

K:\clients\00\00758\1100-1199\1149USC1\P-Amendment and Response.doc